



# LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMISSION ON HIV

3530 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1140 • Los Angeles, CA 90010 • TEL (213) 738-2816 • FAX (213) 637-4748  
www.hivcommission-la.info

## OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES June 29, 2015

**Approved**  
**7/27/2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	PUBLIC	COMM STAFF/ CONSULTANTS
Joseph Green, <i>Co-Chair</i>	Traci Bivens-Davis ( <i>Alt. to Smith</i> )	Kevin Donnelly	Jane Nachazel
AJ King, MPH, <i>Co-Chair</i>	Rev. Alejandro Escoto, MA ( <i>Alt. to Rivera</i> )	Bradley Land	James Stewart
Lisa Goldstein	Douglas Lantis, MBA ( <i>on leave</i> )		Nicole Werner
Michael Johnson, Esq.	Anthony Mills, MD ( <i>full to Goldstein</i> )		
Ted Liso/Edd Cockrell	Sabel Samon-Loreca/Danielle Campbell, MPH		
José Munõz		<b>DHSP STAFF</b>	
Juan Rivera		None	
Ricky Rosales			
Terry Smith, MPA			
Kevin Stalter			
Terrell Winder			

### CONTENTS OF COMMITTEE PACKET

- 1) **Agenda:** Operations Committee Meeting Agenda, 6/29/2015
- 2) **Minutes:** Operations Committee Meeting Minutes, 6/3/2015
- 3) **Policy/Procedure:** #09.4204: Commission Candidate Interviews, 6/09/2011
- 4) **Policy/Procedure:** #09.4205: Commission Membership Evaluation and Nomination Process, 5/12/2011-rev
- 5) **Policy/Procedure:** #06.1000: Bylaws of the Los Angeles County Commission on HIV, 7/11/2013
- 6) **Table:** Membership Drive - Cohort 2, Commission members due for renewal, 6/29/2015
- 7) **Outline:** Mentorship Program, Draft, 6/29/2015

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mr. Green called the meeting to order at 10:05 am.
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**  
**MOTION #1:** Approve the Agenda Order (*Passed by Consensus*).
3. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**  
**MOTION #2:** Approve the 6/3/2015 Operations Committee Meeting minutes, as presented (*Passed by Consensus*).
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT (Non-Agendized or Follow-Up):** There were no comments.
5. **COMMITTEE COMMENT (Non-Agendized or Follow-Up):** There were no comments.
6. **COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS ELECTIONS:**
  - Previous nominees were Messrs. Donnelly, King and Stalter. There were no new nominees and Mr. Donnelly withdrew.**MOTION #3:** Elect Mr. King and Mr. Stalter to one-year terms as Operations Co-Chairs (*Passed by Consensus*).

**7. CO-CHAIRS' REPORT:** Mr. Green noted Executive referred the membership process back to Operations. Discussion below.

**8. MEMBERSHIP MANAGEMENT:**

**A. Policies and Procedures:**

- Mr. Stalter was at Executive and read the 2011 Policy/Procedures on interviews and evaluation/nomination processes. His understanding was that policy changes were approved by the Commission. As that was not done, the 2011 Policies/Procedures still applied and, therefore, only Operations members would do interviews versus the recent process.
- Mr. King noted the Committee decided at its last meeting that Operations members who were not renewing would interview new and renewal candidates in teams with additional interviewers from Executive, as needed. This approach was developed by the Integration Task Force. After integration, Operations felt it better suited the new Commission.
- Mr. Johnson said the Integration Task Force developed a framework that was authorized by the Executive Office and reviewed by the District Offices and County Counsel. The new Bylaws and all prior Commission and Prevention Planning Committee Policies/Procedures were approved en masse as an initial framework for the new body at its first meeting. Consequently, unless changed by the body, the pre-existing Policies/Procedures would apply.
- Mr. Smith felt it should be acknowledged that every process step was presented to the Commission, not developed in isolation. Mr. King added the then Executive Director, Craig Vincent-Jones, was part of process development. After integration, he noted the body was in a new phase and could do what best met the need. That was the sole goal.
- Since then, concerns were raised about using Alternates, especially new ones, as interviewers. Some emails went back and forth, perhaps more than was suitable, and the issue was referred to Executive. Executive chose to refer it to Operations to review Policies/Procedures and decide on a process for the 2nd Cohort which is ready for interviews. He did not feel all Policies/Procedures had to be finalized at this meeting. The goal was to identify a process to seat this cohort that is fair, transparent and reflects Operations' values. It may or may not be what was decided before.
- Mr. Stalter noted Bylaws state Operations is responsible for the process, but felt it unworkable for the full Committee to conduct all interviews. Interview teams might be comprised of two Operations members and one other.
- Mr. Johnson noted Operations could choose not to interview everyone. In the past, Operations selectively interviewed based on various factors, e.g., renewal candidates were not interviewed barring a compelling reason such as multiple candidates for a seat or group of seats. He felt that maintained an open, transparent process so long as Operations affirms it did not find a reason to interview everyone and chose not to do so to better focus time on other work.
- Mr. Cockrell preferred interviewing everyone. It offers a means for Operations and candidates to evaluate candidates' Commission performance. Policies/Procedures questions complicate that, but it should be addressed. He added some renewal Operations members preferred not to serve on interview teams which would reduce available participants.
- Ms. Werner recalled Operations had planned only to address expiring seats with the 2nd Cohort. Then it planned to revisit and streamline the entire process including Policies/Procedures, the application and interview questions.
- Mr. King thought there were approximately 26 seats. It was a cumbersome process, but it was chosen because there originally many who wanted to join so the goal was a process that would be completely equitable and transparent.
- Ms. Nachazel offered context for continued use of the integration rather than the prior selection process. There were two core reasons. 1. Transparency: The prior process often had viable reasons for interviewing one candidate versus another, but questions routinely circulated in the body about such choices. The goal was to ensure all felt the playing field was level. 2. Afford Operations an opportunity to gather input from candidates on what did, or did not, work for them. Even exit interviews were offered. The goal was to inform training and procedures.
- Mr. Stalter suggested not interviewing renewal candidates for an unopposed seat. Application could also provide information on whether a candidate needed to be interviewed. That approach could reduce the number of interviews.
- Mr. Smith urged clarifying the question, i.e., whether it is about the entire process or who is being interviewed. He challenged the body to move the process forward. Serving on the Commission is a privilege, not a right. All should explain why they should be on the Commission. A seat need not be filled unless an appropriate candidate is available.
- Mr. Winder was unclear about concerns with Alternates interviewing. He felt the process was transparent as it was.
- Mr. Johnson agreed being a Commission member was not a right, but Operations has the responsibility to determine when there are concerns, e.g., attendance or participation. Operations also weighs multiple factors, e.g., consumers have different roles and challenges than institutional members do. Selective interviewing saves time for other work.
- Regarding Alternates, interviewers need to put candidates at ease, introduce them to the seating process and answer questions. He felt new Commission members, especially Alternates, lacked experience to meet interviewing needs.

## Operations Committee Meeting Minutes

June 29, 2015

Page 3 of 5

---

- Mr. Stewart clarified that any set of bylaws assigning a responsibility to a person or group only means the designated party is responsible for ensuring the responsibility is done - not that the designated party must do it. The Commission's 7/11/2013 Bylaws designates Operations as responsible for the membership process, i.e., to ensure it is done properly and consistently. The pre-integration 2011 Policy/Procedure on interviews is mostly general but, per Definitions, designates Operations Committee under "Interview" and members of the Operations Committee under "Interviewer."
- Alternates are not separate members of Operations. Per the Bylaws, "Any Commission member who has disclosed that s/he is living with HIV is entitled to as Alternate who shall serve in the place of the Commissioner when necessary." Mr. Land noted Alternates can also be appointed to serve a secondary assignment as full members of a Committee.
- Mr. Stewart noted no reason to interview all or some candidates, but the process should be consistent with objective criteria. Interview questions and scoring sheets are a process function so the Commission need not approve them.
- Mr. Rivera suggested including renewing Operations members as interviewers to facilitate work. Mr. King noted Operations chose not to include them based on transparency, but agreed conflict only occurred if two candidates sought the same seat. On the other hand, seating was done holistically, i.e., after scoring there was general discussion on identifying seats for candidates which might, or might not, include multiple seats. The decision could be adjusted.
- Mr. Rosales noted two, separate issues. 1. Operations has discussed a process over the past few months and made some decisions. That should be confirmed with any adjustments for this 2nd Cohort. 2. The 2011 Policies/Procedures need to be reviewed and updated to reflect the new body. That can be done after this 2nd Cohort is seated.
- Mr. Winder noted the membership process already included subjective elements. He felt using renewal candidates as interviewers added another, but could be acceptable if they were not in the room when the slate was developed.
- Mr. Cockrell was also leery of using renewal candidates. He supported including Alternates as interviewers because they have experienced what it is like to navigate joining the Commission and can answer questions.
- Mr. Land noted all Commission members have inherent conflicts of some kind and always need to address them. That is why some votes are preceded by statements of conflict of interest. That conflict makes transparency key to all work.
- Mr. Johnson urged not using an all or nothing approach. In the past, Operations members who were renewing left the room during interviews and slating of seats for which they were eligible. An interview team can exclude renewing Operations members with a conflict for seats that team addresses while freeing the members to serve on other teams.
- Mr. Stewart suggested defining "conflict of interest" by eligibility for type of seat, e.g., consumers would not be able to interview other consumers, but someone on an institutional seat, e.g., City of Los Angeles, could interview anyone.
- Mr. Winder said he seeks the least conflict possible for a transparent process. He felt, however, there was another kind of conflict as well. Operations developed a process to ensure the Membership Drive - 2nd Cohort moved forward to get work back on time, but Executive raised questions and, while it has the right, the process was behind again.
- Mr. Stewart noted, as institutional seat candidates were nominated by their bodies, interviews were unnecessary. Pertinent seats were: City of West Hollywood (Giugni), Board Office District 2 (Watts), Board Office District 4 (Johnson), HOPWA (Flynn), and Part D (Spencer). Mr. King added uncontested renewal candidates were not interviewed last time.
- ➡ Agreed to address Policies/Procedures after the 2nd Cohort was seated.

### B. Membership Drive - Cohort 2: There was no additional discussion.

#### 1) Interview Schedule:

- ➡ Agreed conflict of interest does not exist if the interviewer and interviewee cannot take the same seat.
- ➡ Interview teams will be composed of: Ms. Bivens-Davis, Ms. Campbell, Mr. Cockrell, Mr. King, Mr. Liso, Mr. Rivera and Mr. Stalter (Operations); and Mr. Johnson, Mr. Land and Mr. Rosales (Executive).
- ➡ Messrs. Smith and Winder chose to recuse themselves from participation on interview teams.
- ➡ Interviews will be scheduled for half of the week of 7/13/2015 and half of the week of 7/20/2015. (Mr. King was not available for the week of 7/20/2015 and Mr. Stalter was not available for the week of 7/13/2015.)
- ➡ Agreed not to interview renewal candidates for the five institutional seats with expiring terms.

**MOTION #4: (Stalter/Liso):** Proceed with Membership Drive - 2nd Cohort interview process as originally outlined with three people interview teams that return results to the full Operations Committee with the following exceptions:

1. At least two interview team members will be Operations members with one Executive member, if needed;
2. Not more than one Alternate, who must be Alternate for an Operations Committee member, per interview team;
3. Operations members who are renewal candidates are allowed to serve as interviewers unless the candidate being interviewed presents a conflict for their seat (**Passed by Consensus**).

## Operations Committee Meeting Minutes

June 29, 2015

Page 4 of 5

---

### 9. TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING:

- Mr. Johnson was at a recent Los Angeles Housing Services Authority (LAHSA) meeting. All Commissioners had laptops which cost approximately \$400. The facilitator automatically set laptops to pertinent documents which kept the meeting moving.
- Laptops and associated work stations could be purchased for less than the Commission's current printing budget while still funding some printed copies for the public. Budget season was starting so this would be a good time to revisit the issue.
- Mr. Cockrell favored technology, but noted LAHSA only has five Commissioners. He felt other priorities took precedence. now. Mr. Johnson said it would take at least a year to effect even if approved. He was suggesting starting the conversation.
- Mr. Rosales said Craig Vincent-Jones advocated for years to bring modern technology to the Commission, but the Executive Office was reluctant. It will be necessary to document why it would be cost effective over time and more efficient.
- Mr. Johnson said Mr. Vincent-Jones was also working with Mario Pérez, MPH and Kyle Baker, DHSP, to evaluate how funding might be shifted to allow Net County Cost to fund the upgrade. That could be another option.
- ➡ Agendize Operations motion at the next Executive Committee to fund updated technology in order to re-open discussion.

#### A. New Member Orientation:

- Mr. King reported the Work Group met and he also spoke with Dawn McClendon about HRSA Technical Assistance (TA) to provide the training. He suggested HRSA and the CDC might jointly provide training to reflect integration.
- Mentorship remains part of Orientation. Mr. Munõz provided a draft Mentorship Program with mentors as a group developing a work plan based on new members' needs and facilitating a new member monthly meeting one week after the Commission. Meetings will present a topic, e.g., Commission structure, followed by discussion on the topic and ending with a half-hour of socializing. Planning will address the different needs of institutional and consumer/Alternate new members. Mentors will also meet one-on-one with their individual mentee for support and to evaluate progress.
- ➡ Ms. McClendon will check St. Anne's Maternity Home availability for possible Orientation on 8/21/2015 or 8/28/2015.
- ➡ Operations will review the draft Mentorship Program preparatory to finalizing it at the next meeting.

#### B. Comprehensive Training Plan (CTP): There was no additional discussion.

### 10. NEXT STEPS:

#### A. 2015 Operations Committee Work Plan:

- Mr. Cockrell suggested re-organizing and streamlining the Work Plan into core areas: 1. Membership including related matters, e.g., Training and Policies/Procedures; 2. Community relations; and 3. Internal. He offered to assist in revision.
- Mr. Land said the Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism (AAM) is legislatively mandated so should be separate.
- Mr. King said, per the proposed Community Work Plan category, Executive has discussed the need for outreach to women and other subpopulations. Mr. Cockrell added the Community Engagement Task Force is also addressing that.
- Mr. Land said only five Commission members have RSVPd for the Trans Summit. The transgender members are disappointed at the poor response. He felt that also pertains to the Operation goal to ensure parity in leadership.
- Mr. Stewart noted there are advantages and disadvantages to the open voting process, e.g., for Co-Chairs. A branch of social science called social choice theory addresses why groups make decisions the way they do. If someone takes the lead in the first quarter of an open voice tally then that person will win because people want to be on the winning side. Ryan White requires open votes, but there are consequences. Requirements for specific seats can modify results.
- Mr. Smith said parity is very important, but at times people have been seated only because of who they were and were actually set up for failure. He is uncomfortable with affirmative action that is well-meaning, but may go awry. There were Commission members seated previously who never spoke and did not contribute to the Commission.
- Mr. Johnson said the Commission has always struggled with representation, e.g., how to define "recently incarcerated," but always had three or four consumer members truly living on the edge of function and access to care. Experienced members often come to respect expertise and degrees. Yet he recalled several consumers, not polished speakers and writers, who altered the trajectory of decision-making and effected real change by injecting a reality about barriers the Commission or grantee were inadvertently erecting. Their voices are important and are not as common today.
- Mr. Smith added it is complicated. He urged not leaning too far in either direction and ensuring such members are supported. Mr. Rivera said it is also important to ensure they are capable of speaking at the table or the benefit is lost.
- ➡ Current Community Engagement Task Force members were: Ms. Bivens-Davis, Ms. Campbell and Mr. Cockrell. Mr. Cockrell invited others possibly interested in joining to see him after the meeting.
- ➡ Messrs. King and Stalter will follow-up with Ms. McClendon on Mr. Pérez's review of the AAM prior to submission.
- ➡ Messrs. King and Stalter will discuss revision of the Work Plan.

## Operations Committee Meeting Minutes

June 29, 2015

Page 5 of 5

---

**B. Task/Assignment Recap:** Action items were reviewed.

**C. Agenda Development for Next Meeting:**

- ➡ The 7/27/2015 Operations meeting will be 9:00 am to 12:00 noon. The primary agenda item will be to review scores of interviewed candidates and develop a slate in time for the August Commission meeting.
- ➡ Other 7/27/2015 agenda items are: Work Plan reorganization; AAM update; conflict of interest definition; training TA.

**11. ANNOUNCEMENTS:** There were no announcements.

**12. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 11:50 am.